



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,862	09/11/2003	Wael R. Joseph	KCC 4979.2 (K-C 19,378C)	5051
321	7590	09/08/2006	EXAMINER	
SENNIGER POWERS ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE 16TH FLOOR ST LOUIS, MO 63102			AHMED, HASAN SYED	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1615

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/659,862	JOSEPH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hasan S. Ahmed	1615	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
<b>Period for Reply</b>			
<p>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</li> </ul> <p>Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>			
<b>Status</b>			
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 July 2006</u>.</p> <p>2a)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL.                    2b)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>			
<b>Disposition of Claims</b>			
<p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-59</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>31-59</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>			
<b>Application Papers</b>			
<p>9)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)<input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</p> <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</p>			
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119</b>			
<p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All    b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p>			
<p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p>			
<b>Attachment(s)</b>			
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.</p> <p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>			

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date  
:10/31/03;10/18/04;11/15/04;12/16/04.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Receipt is acknowledged of applicants': (1) Response to Restriction Requirement filed on 17 July 2006; and (2) Information Disclosure Statements filed on 31 October 2003, 18 October 2004, 15 November 2004, and 16 December 2004.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicants' election with traverse of Group I (claims 1-30) in the reply filed on 17 July 2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the grounds that combining the search of Groups I and II would not impose a serious search burden. This is not found persuasive because Group II contains dispersing agents not found in Group I (see claims 32 and 33); thus the groups require separate and distinct searches.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 31-59 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to nonelected groups, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction requirement in the reply filed on 17 July 2006.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informality: "antiviral" is misspelled (see page 40, line 4). Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the specification does not teach how to use glucosylceramide, *i.e.*, no amounts, weights, or percentages are given; no mention is made as to how the glucosylceramide is effectively incorporated into the tissue product claimed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-23 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McAtee, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,607,980).

McAtee, *et. al.* teach a tissue product (see col. 4, line 16). The tissue product disclosed is comprised of:

- the moisturizing and lubricating composition of instant claim 1 (see col. 13, lines 40-63);
- the emollient of instant claim 1 (see col. 9, line 60);
- the humectant of instant claim 1 (see col. 13, lines 40-63);
- the immobilizing agent of instant claim 1 (see col. 16, lines 59-64);

Art Unit: 1615

- the compatibilizing agent of instant claim 1 (see col. 13, line 53);
- the vegetable oil of instant claim 2 (see col. 18, lines 14-15);
- the dimethicone of instant claim 3 (see col. 19, lines 65-66);
- the glycerin of instant claims 5-7 (see col. 17, line 42; examples 1-7);
- the polyethylene glycol of instant claims 9 and 10 (see col. 16, lines 59-64);
- the fatty alcohol, stearyl alcohol, of instant claims 9 and 11 (see col. 16, line 13);
- the butylene glycol of instant claim 12 (see col. 13, line 53);
- the dispersing agent of instant claim 13 (see col. 20, line 2);
- the polydimethylsiloxane of instant claim 14 (see col. 20, line 2);
- the skin barrier enhancing agent of instant claim 16 (see col. 20, lines 52-64);
- the coconut oil of instant claim 17 (see col. 20, lines 52-64);
- the tocopherol of instant claims 19 and 20 (see col. 10, line 6);
- the cholesterol of instant claim 22 (see col. 18, line 44);
- the ceramide of instant claim 24 (see col. 10, line 31); and
- the surfactant of instant claim 25 (see col. 4, line 30).

McAtee, *et. al.* explain that combining the disclosed ingredients into one tissue product is beneficial for, "...conditioning the skin, for desquamating the skin, for cleansing and clarifying the skin, for reducing skin pore size, and also for relieving dry skin." See col. 1, lines 10-14.

McAtee, *et. al.* do not explicitly teach all the percentages recited in instant claims 1, 4, 8, 15, 18, and 21, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine suitable percentages through

routine or manipulative experimentation to obtain the best possible results, as these are variable parameters attainable within the art.

Moreover, generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456; 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Applicants have not demonstrated any unexpected or unusual results, which accrue from the instant percentage ranges.

The McAtee, et. al. reference is silent with respect to the (1) phase temperatures of instant claims 1 and 28-30; (2) melting point of instant claim 26; (3) and penetration hardness of instant claim 27. Applicant’s article is the same as the prior art. It contains the same components in the same configuration. Properties are the same when the structure and composition are the same. Thus, burden shifts to applicant to show unexpected results, by declaration or otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594. In the alternative, the claimed properties would have been present once the composition was employed in its intended use. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine an emollient , a humectant, an immobilizing agent, and a compatibilizing agent into a tissue product, as taught by McAtee, et. al. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine these ingredients into a tissue product for the beneficial effects of

conditioning the skin, desquamating the skin, cleansing and clarifying the skin, reducing skin pore size, and relieving dry skin, as explained by McAtee, *et. al.*

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-61 of copending Application No. 10/659,969 ('969). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '969 claims an absorbent product comprising a moisturizing and lubricating composition comprising an emollient, a humectant, an immobilizing agent, and a compatibilizing agent. See claim 1.

Art Unit: 1615

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hasan S. Ahmed whose telephone number is 571-272-4792. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

\*\*\*

  
MICHAEL P. WOODWARD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600